UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Unite	ed States of America,	Case No CR 18-00240
	Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Carlos	Defendant(s).	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on July 6, 2018, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from July 6, 2018 to July 1, 2018 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):		
	Failure to grant a continuance would be See 8 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
	The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).	
	The state of the s	ny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, liligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
\searrow	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED:		LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant Assistant United States Attorney		

FILED

JUL 06 2018

SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA